

**NATIONAL INSTITUTE FOR HEALTH AND CARE  
EXCELLENCE**

**HEALTH TECHNOLOGY APPRAISAL PROGRAMME**

**Equality impact assessment – Guidance development**

**Cemiplimab for treating recurrent or metastatic cervical cancer that has progressed on or after platinum-based chemotherapy**

The impact on equality has been assessed during this appraisal according to the principles of the NICE equality scheme.

**Final draft guidance**

(when no draft guidance was issued)

- |   |
|---|
| 1. Have the potential equality issues identified during the scoping process been addressed by the committee, and, if so, how?   |
| Yes – during scoping it was highlighted that, in deprived areas, cervical cancer screening rates are lower, and cervical cancer rates are higher.<br><br>The EAG noted that the company had not provided a specific analysis, such as a distributional cost-effectiveness analysis, demonstrating that recommending cemiplimab has the potential to reduce health inequalities. It added that these disparities are unlikely to be impacted by whether this technology is made available for this indication, because they are mostly associated with disease incidence or delayed diagnosis. The committee agreed that differences in prevalence and patient populations cannot usually be resolved in a technology appraisal. But the committee can consider whether a specific equality issue has a significant impact on access to treatments. The committee noted the disparities in care and unequal access to care based on specific demographics. |

2. Have any other potential equality issues been raised in the submissions, expert statements or academic report, and, if so, how has the committee addressed these?

Yes – as well as reiterating the issues identified at scoping, stakeholders also highlighted that people from deprived areas are likely to have more advanced disease at diagnosis. Stakeholders also highlighted that the incidence of cervical cancer is higher in non-White ethnic groups and in people who have emigrated from Africa, parts of Asia and Eastern Europe.

The committee recognised that race is a protected characteristic under the Equality Act 2010. But the committee concluded that its recommendations would not affect people protected by the equality legislation any differently. So the committee agreed that this was not a potential equalities issue.

3. Have any other potential equality issues been identified by the committee, and, if so, how has the committee addressed these?

No further issues identified.

4. Do the recommendations make it more difficult in practice for a specific group to access the technology compared with other groups? If so, what are the barriers to, or difficulties with, access for the specific group?

No

5. Is there potential for the recommendations to have an adverse impact on people with disabilities because of something that is a consequence of the disability?

No

6. Are there any recommendations or explanations that the committee could make to remove or alleviate barriers to, or difficulties with, access identified in questions 4 or 5, or otherwise fulfil NICE's obligations to promote equality?
No

7. Have the committee's considerations of equality issues been described in the final draft guidance, and, if so, where?
Yes – please see final draft guidance, section 3.15.

**Approved by Associate Director (name):** Ian Watson

**Date:** 30 May 2026